

**Paper: “Contribution à l’Étude des Macrophytes de la Mare d’Albarkaïzé dans le Département de Gaya au Niger Occidental (Afrique de l’Ouest)”**

**Submitted: 13 September 2022**

**Accepted: 03 February 2023**

**Published: 28 February 2023**

Corresponding Author: Alhou Bassirou

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2023.v19n6p272](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2023.v19n6p272)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Imorou Toko Ibrahim  
Université de Parakou, Bénin

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 3: Hama Oumarou  
Université Djibo Hamani de Tahoua, Niger

# ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

*ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!*

Reviewer Name: IMOROU TOKO Ibrahim	
University/Country: Université de Parakou / Bénin	
Date Manuscript Received: 12/12/2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 20/12/2022
Manuscript Title: Contribution à l'étude des macrophytes de la mare d'Albarkaizé, département de Gaya au Niger	
ESJ Manuscript Number: ---24.---85.09.2022--- (0985/22)	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: YES	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: YES	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: YES	

## Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>5</b>

<i>Yes</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>YES</b>
<i>Well elaborated but the contribution of the work needs to be specified in the last sentence. See the word version in track changes mode</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>YES</b>
<i>Some minor errors exist in the manuscript. The authors have to accept the corrections I inserted</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>NO</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Comment l'eau a été échantillons, est ce dans toutes les stations ? Comment les échantillons ont été conservés sur le terrain et avant le dosage</i></li> <li>• <i>Décrivez la technique de dosage des nutriments</i></li> <li>• <i>Quel appareil avez-vous utilisé pour les mesures in situ</i></li> <li>• <i>Préciser l'auteur de la classification pour les coefficients d'abondance-dominance attribués</i></li> <li>• <i>Aucune précision sur les analyses statistiques alors que dans le résumé vous avez fait mention des analyses multivariées (classification hiérarchique ascendante,) Quel jeu de données avez-vous utilisé pour cela ???</i></li> <li>• <i>Le coefficient de similitude de Sorensen est dans discussion mais pas matériels et méthodes et résultats. Il faut l'intégrer si c'est vraiment calculé, au cas contraire l'enlever</i></li> </ul>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>NO</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Interpréter les différences entre les graphes dans la figure 2</i></li> <li>• <i>Préciser ce que c'est les lettres a, b, c, d, etc.... dans le titre de la figure 2 (comme légende)</i></li> <li>• <i>Il faut veiller à ce que tous les noms scientifiques soient en italique</i></li> <li>• <i>Mettre les légendes pour expliquer les tableaux et figures quand c'est nécessaire</i></li> </ul>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>YES</b>
<i>RAS</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>NO</b>
<i>Uniformiser la manière de citer pour respecter pour tous les instructions du journal</i>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

All our comments/inputs must be considered

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

Make sure that all the comments/inputs have been integrated before the publication of the manuscript

# ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

*ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!*

Reviewer Name:	Email:
University/Country:	
Date Manuscript Received: <b>12 décembre 2022</b>	Date Review Report Submitted: <b>19 décembre 2022</b>
Manuscript Title: <i>Contribution à l'étude des macrophytes de la mare d'Albarkaïzé, département de Gaya au Niger</i>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: <b>0985/22</b>	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <b>Yes</b>	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: <b>Yes</b>	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: <b>Yes</b>	

## Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(le titre est clair et reflète bien le contenu du manuscrit)</i>	

<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(le style du document est bon et de manière générale, il y'a très peu de fautes, les quelques coquilles sont marquées au rouge)</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(La méthode a bien été expliquée, mais in faut compléter par quelques aspects de l'analyse et traitement de données notamment la classification hiérarchique ascendante avec R )</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Les résultats sont très clairs, mais il faut harmonizer le nombre de relevés effectués énoncé dans le résumé (46) et celui présenté dans les résultats (47), les tableaux 7 et 8 ne sont pas présentés, harmonizer ou justifier la variation de nombre des espèces inventories (68 et 70)</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(La bibliographie est riche de 37 references, mais il y'a quelqu'unnes qui ne sont pas citées dans le texte)</i>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed: accepté avec des corrections mineures	<b>x</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

Les suggestions de corrections sont marquées dans le document.

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

# ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

*ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!*

Reviewer Name: Hama Oumarou	
University/Country: Université Djibo Hamani de Tahoua, NIGER	
Date Manuscript Received: 10/2022	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Contribution à l'étude des macrophytes de la mare d'Albarkaïzé dans le département de Gaya au Niger occidental (Afrique de l'Ouest)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0985/22	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <b>Yes</b>	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: <b>Yes</b>	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: <b>Yes</b>	

## Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>2.5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>Précisez la portion géographique du Niger occidental.</b>	

<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	
Assez de Cookies, et maladdresses	2
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>1.5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>Pas beaucoup d'erreur grammaticale</b>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>3.5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>La méthodologie est assez descriptive.</b>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>3.5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>La présentation des Résultats est Claire et contient assez de données qui renseignent sur la thématique</b>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Il manqué des perspectives dans le cadre des travaux futurs.....	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Les références sont assez exhaustives	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>OK</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

### **Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

Sous réserve de l'intégration totale des corrections et suggestions, je marque mon accord pour l'acceptation du manuscrit dans European Journal of Science.



**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:** Adresser leurs sincères remerciements à l'endroit de l'évaluateur